Appl. No. 10/680,345   Reply to Office Action of July 31, 2008
Response dated Oct. 24, 2008

REMARKS

The July 31, 2008 Final Office Action: (i) rejected all claims, 1-28, pending in the application under 35 USC §103; (ii) rejected claims 1 and 15 under 35 USC §112; and (iii) objected to claims 15-28 as being duplicative of claims 1-14. The present Amendment and Response: (x) cancels claims 10 and 15-28; (y) amends claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 11 and 12; and (z) submits arguments in favor of patenting. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the enclosed amendments and careful consideration of the remarks.

In the Claims

Claim Objections

Claims 15-28 are objected to as being duplicative of claims 1-14. Applicant cancels claims 15-28 and thus renders all objections to claims 15-28 moot.

Claim Rejections- 35 USC §112

Claims 1 and 15 stand rejected under 35 USC §112 for being indefinite, in particular, the Examiner states that the phrase "understandable to naïve users" is not defined by the claim, the specification or one of ordinary skill. In response to the Examiner's rejection, Applicant amends claim 1 as follows:

"receiving a user-entered ~~policies~~ call feature policy entered in natural language that is ~~in a representation~~ understandable to ~~naïve~~ a users ~~and capable of translation into a formal executable language~~;

Applicant submits that "natural language that is understandable to a user" is definite and clearly conveys that the user is able to enter the call feature policy in a language that the user can understand (e.g., not a policy language). Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of the Section 112 rejection to claim 1.

Applicant cancels claim 15 and thus renders all rejections to claim 15 moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

All claims, 1-28, stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Lineman et al., U.S. Publication No. 2003/0065942 published on April 3, 2003, in view of Ahlstrom et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,327,618 issued on December 4, 2001, and further in view of Ahlstrom et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,418468 issued on July 9, 2002. For the following reasons stated below, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant cancels claims 15-28 and thus renders all rejections to claims 15-28 moot.

6

Lineman Reference

Applicant has described the Lineman reference in previous responses, thus it would be redundant to once again repeat the same herein. Nonetheless, it is helpful to point out particular passages of Lineman. Specifically, Lineman discloses a method for managing the security policies for users in computers in a network which policies pertain to company information and assets. When the administrator creates a security policy document, which contains appropriate controls required to enforce the security policy on various computing platforms, a direct link is created between the security policy document and the interested people. In other words, Lineman discloses that the manual task of communicating these controls to various persons in a company responsible for administering these computer platforms is now eliminated. Further, the Lineman invention tracks the people's access to the security policy document and measures their understanding of the policy, e.g., through quizzes following review of the document. Thus, the compliance of both people and platforms may be measured through one software program. [Summary of Invention]

Contrary to Lineman, Applicant discloses and claims a method for *"personalizing user call features in a policy-based management system for a telephony call processing system."* Lineman fails to disclose, teach or suggest any methods for use in a *telephony call processing system*, and certainly does not disclose methods for *personalizing user call features.*

Furthermore, Lineman is designed for distributing and tracking the viewing of a security policy document. For instance, Lineman discloses that when the user wishes to read a security policy document from the policy list, the user may click on a name which is linked to a security policy document stored in the system. The security policy document is then rendered in a document interface on a user website screen. Completing their review of the security policy document, the user may then verify that they have read the document by clicking a field on the interface. Thereafter, the user may be automatically presented with quiz questions concerning the security policy document. Acknowledgement that the document was reviewed is then recorded within a database on the policy sever. [Lineman paragraphs [0073-0074]]

Contrary to Applicant's claims as recited, Lineman fails to disclose that a user can personalize user call features by entering a call feature policy in a natural language and when the policy is uploaded for execution by the telephony call processing system, the

7

when the policy is uploaded for execution by the telephony call processing system, the policy is personalized and local to only the user. There is nothing "personal" about the Lineman policy except that each person is able to view the policy document and then must complete the review and take a quiz. The policy document is distributed equally to all required persons for review and is not "personalized" in anyway, nor is the user able to "personalize" the document.

Ahlstrom I, II References

The Examiner admits that Lineman fails to disclose "detecting common feature interaction errors in the policy"; "reporting the errors to the user" and "providing the user with a recommendation for correction of the errors." The Examiner cites Ahlstrom I and II to fill in the deficiencies, and in particular the Examiner states that it would have been obvious to modify the teachings of Lineman by "detecting, analyzing, and reporting common feature interaction errors to a user as taught by Ahlstrom in order to allow the user to remove a conflict from conflicting policies." Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's combining of Lineman with Ahlstrom I or II. For example, there is absolutely no reason for Lineman to include detection, analyzing or reporting of errors with use of a policy conflict detection language, because Lineman only discloses *viewing* a security policy document and doesn't disclose that *the user can enter any policies directly and personalize them for the user's own need.* The only "entering" done by the user in Lineman is to indicate that the review of the policy document is complete and perhaps entering answers to quiz questions post-review. There would be no need for conflict detect to occur because there are no other personal policies that the user could possibly conflict with.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the combination of Lineman and Ahlstrom is improper, nonetheless, even if the proposed combination, as suggested by the Examiner, was made, Applicant's claims as recited would not result. Thus, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the Section 103 rejections to claims 1 and 2.

Remaining References

Applicant submits that the combination of Lineman and Ahlstrom I or II is improper and fails to teach each and every element of Applicant's independent claim 1. Accordingly, the inclusion of additional references fails to render claim 1 obvious, for which claims 2-14 depend.

Appl. No. 10/680,345   Reply to Office Action of July 31, 2008
Response dated Oct. 24, 2008

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant requests entry of the enclosed amendments, reconsideration of the claim objections, and withdrawal of the Sections 112 and 103 rejections. Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the above in greater detail or deem that further amendments should be made to improve the application, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Mitel Networks Corporation

Date: _October 24, 2008_   By: _Michelle Whittington_

Michelle R. Whittington, Esq.
Corporate IP Counsel
Reg. No. 43,844

MITEL NETWORKS CORPORATION
7300 W. Boston St.
Chandler, AZ 85226
Direct: (480) 961-9000 x21352
Facsimile:(480) 961-8073
Email: michelle_whittington@mitel.com